

Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/779,368 Examiner DENNIS G. BONSHOCK	LUDWIG, LESTER F. Art Unit 2173	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) DENNIS G. BONSHOCK. (3) _____.

(2) Craig W. Schmoyer. (4) _____.

Date of Interview: 12 June 2009.

Type: a) Telephonic b) Video Conference
c) Personal [copy given to: 1) applicant 2) applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) Yes e) No.

If Yes, brief description: _____.

Claim(s) discussed: 1, 31, and 39.

Identification of prior art discussed: Baudel, Barber, and Meriaz.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) was reached. g) was not reached. h) N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Clarification of the claims was discussed to read on the previously discussed limitation of two different UI devices being located in the same parent UI device.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

/Dennis G. Bonshock/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2173

6-22-09

Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/779,368	LUDWIG, LESTER F.	
	Examiner DENNIS G. BONSHOCK	Art Unit 2173	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) DENNIS G. BONSHOCK. (3) _____.

(2) Craig W. Schmoyer. (4) _____.

Date of Interview: 12 June 2009.

Type: a) Telephonic b) Video Conference
c) Personal [copy given to: 1) applicant 2) applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) Yes e) No.

If Yes, brief description: _____.

Claim(s) discussed: 1, 31, and 39.

Identification of prior art discussed: Baudel, Barber, and Meriaz.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) was reached. g) was not reached. h) N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Clarification of the claims was discussed to read on the previously discussed limitation of two different UI devices being located in the same parent UI device.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

/Dennis G. Bonshock/ Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2173	6-22-09
---	---------